1	MR. ZOOK: Oh, yes, sir.
2	THE COURT: He'll be released on his subpoena.
3	Call your next witness.
4	MS. BECKER: Thank you. The state would call
5	Detective Mark Daggy.
6	THE COURT: Raise your right hand, sir.
7	(The witness was sworn.)
8	THE WITNESS: I do.
9	THE COURT: Take the witness stand.
10	MARK DAGGY
11	called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
12	sworn, testified as follows:
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. BECKER:
15	Q Mr. Daggy, would you please introduce yourself to
16	our jury?
17	A My name is Mark Daggy.
18	Q What do you do for a living?
19	A I'm a detective with the Elkhart Police Department.
20	Q Is there an area of the detective bureau at the
21	Elkhart Police Department in which your specialize?
22	A Yes, I do.
23	Q What area would that be?
24	A It's the homicide unit.
25	Q In order to become a detective and then specialize

1		in the homicide unit, what kind of training and
2	2	experience have gone to?
3		A I went to a two-week homicide school at the
4		Southern Police Institute that was about two years
5		ago. That's located at the University of
6		Louisville, and I also went to Cold Case School a
7		year ago at an Annapolis, Maryland that was put on
8		by NCIS Naval Criminal Investigative Service in
9		Annapolis, Maryland.
10		2 In addition to that and prior to you homicide
11		school as well as you cold case school, did you
12		have training and experience as a detective with
13		the police department?
14	A.	Yes, I did.
15	0	How long had you been a detective?
16	A	I'd say around before coming to the homicide
17		unit, about a year and a half two years as a
18		regular detective.
19	Q	How long had you been a police officer before you
20		came out?
21	A	Ten years
22	Q	Did you also have to go to the academy, the police
23		academy in order to get training and experience to
24		become a police officer?
25	A	Yes, I did.
- 1		

1		Q Have you also gone through many continuing
2		education type seminars to teach you different
3		skills in being a police officer and detective?
4	7	Yes, I have.
5	2	What kinds of schools have you gone to to become a
6		detective?
7	A	Went to Reid Interrogation Schools. That's one
8		that really comes to mind as far as being a
9		detective. There was a lot of on-the-job training.
10		I have been to several undercover schools.
11	Q	In fact, part of the time that you were a police
12		officer you did serve undercover. Correct?
13	A	That's correct.
. 4	Q	As part of your undercover duties, was it important
.5		for you to have communication with individuals that
6		may be suspects, may be criminal witnesses, and
7		that type of thing?
8	A	Yes
9	Q	Did you find that the skills that you learned at
		some of these training schools as well as your
L		experience enabled you to have good communication
2		and learn things that maybe somebody else wouldn't
3		be able to learn?
	A	Yes.
	Q	Okay. Do you believe that these skills have
		T.

	J		
	1		enabled you to be well-rounded as a homicide
	2		detective?
:	3	A	Yes, I do.
4	4	Q	All right. And based upon the training and
Ę	5		experience that you have, have you been assigned as
6	5		lead investigator in certain homicide cases
7			currently pending, specifically this one, at
8			Elkhart City Police Department?
9		A	Yes, I have.
10		Q	Let's go ahead and talk about Thanksgiving of 2002
11			and the murder of Helen Sailor. First of all, were
12			you lead detective on that murder in thanksgiving
13			of 2002?
14		A	No, I wasn't.
15		Q	All right. Are you familiar with the officers who
16			were?
17		A	Yes, I am.
18		Q	Who were the officers that were the lead
19			investigators at the time Helen Sailor was
20			murdered?
21		A	At that time, the lead officer was Detective
22			Thayer. He's now a sergeant, uniform division, and
23			Detective D'Andre Christian.
24	(Q	Okay. Now, at the time that the murder occurred,
25			was there an investigation done by Detective Thayer

1 and Detective Christian? 2 Α Yes, there was. What kinds of things were done during that initial 3 0 4 investigation? 5 A Initially they would -- they canvassed the entire apartment complex, witnesses, neighbors. They --6 7 initially the scene was secured. Detective technicians came in and processed the entire scene, 8 performed interviews, just kind of hit the road and 9 10 asking questions of people that were near or 11 resided inside the Waterfall Highrise. 12 Based upon -- well, first of all, what is a canvass Q 13 of the area? Basically, canvassing the area, you can go door to 14 Α 15 door asking if -- you've seen the residents inside the doors, if they've heard anything, something 16 17 unusual. And to me canvassing is, you know, if you 18 seen anything in the immediate area that presents a red flag or need to be -- possibly might be 19 20 evidence. It could be in and around the building. 21 Within the first three days of the investigation, Q were you able to gather or was the police 22 department able to gather quite a bit of 23 information about what had been going on? 24 25 Α Yes.

1 Q Even though they gathered a significant amount of 2 information, were there really any red flags to 3 begin with? No, I don't believe so. I don't -- I don't think 4 Α 5 that at the very beginning a suspect rose to the 6 top. 7 Q Did there come a time when some information 8 involving a person by the name of Lana Canen threw 9 a red flag into the investigation? 10 Α Yes. 11 All right. Now, we can't talk about specifically Q what that is at this point. But let's go ahead and 12 13 discuss what happened with this case after the 14 first three days. 15 I'd say -- well, in November of 2002 when this Α 16 occurred -- can you repeat that? Sure. What happened -- after the first three days, Q. you know, those first three hot days when you talked about the canvassing of the neighborhood, interviewing witnesses, gathering information, were there any suspects at that time? Α No. Okay. Did the investigation continue past that Q time? Α I would say it continued, but it wouldn't -- slowed

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	L	down within the first two to three months. I mean,
2	2	it pretty much slowed down.
3	3	Q Why was that?
4		A I believe the investigators at the time ran out of
5		leads.
6		Q When in an investigation you get a lead, what I
7		would characterize as a red flag, do you send
8		people out, do interviews, try and get to the
9		bottom of that?
10	P	A Yes, we do.
11	Ç	And as a result of following up on these leads, did
·12		a suspect emerge?
13	A	No suspect or suspects emerged.
14	Ω	Okay. Any idea how many detective, officers, ect.,
15		had been working on this investigation?
16	A	Well, initially there probably was a handful of
17		them, maybe four or five; but it ultimately at
18		the beginning I would say Detective Todd Thayer and
19		Detective Christian had the responsibility of this.
20	Q	Did they also have other detectives that would go
21		out and interview people so that they wouldn't have
22		to spread themselves so thin?
23	А	Yes, they did.
24	Q	And did they from time to time, I call it powwow,
25		confer with each other to see what each other had?

1 Α Yes, they did. 2 0 Even with all this work, any suspects? 3 Α No. 4 Q Did there come a time when the homicide unit was 5 formed so that you could devote more time to this 6 type of case? 7 Ά Yes, we did. 8 When the homicide unit was formed, was this one of 0 9 first cases that you took up? 10 I think it was the first case. Α 11 All right. What was special about the homicide 0 unit that enabled you to focus exclusively on this 12 13 case and give it intense attention? 14 We had the luxury -- I mean, this is -- our Α 15 department formed a homicide unit. We never had 16 this before. So we had the luxury of four or five fresh cases looking at a case, not developing any 17 18 tunnel vision, and concentrating all their time on 19 this homicide. 20 And usually, we would work just one homicide 21 case, whether it we cold or a fresh case, we'd look at that one case. And in the past, we wouldn't 22 23 have that luxury. You'd have -- you'd have a 24 detective that would get assigned a homicide case, 25 plus he'd have all these other cases, burglaries or

1	.	robberies so their their case load will build
2		up. We had the luxury of just working on just this
3		one case. Five heads looking into it.
4		Q When homicide took this case on, did you go
5		reinterview individuals that had been originally
6		interviewed back at the time of the murder?
7		A Yes, we did.
8		Q And when was that?
9		A I believe it was August of 2003 is when we started
10		this
11		Okay. And in August of 2003, were able to locate
12		most of the people that had provided information
13		originally?
14	P	Yes.
15	Q	Were all those people reinterviewed?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	After they were reinterviewed, did you learn some
18		additional information that started to kind of fall
19		into a context at this point?
20	A	Yes, we did.
21	Q	Now, although we can't talk specifically, you
22		indicated earlier that there was a red flag that
23		surrounding Lana Canen's name. Correct.
24	A	Correct.
25	Q	Now, did there come a time when Lana Canen was

1	known to be with another person by the name of
2	Nina Nina Porter?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Did somebody go talk to Nina Porter after she had
5	been with Lana Canen from your Police Department?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And after that, did the leads start to develop and
8	things fall into place?
9	A Yes.
10	Q After that occurred, did one of the detectives from
11	homicide actually go interview a person?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Who was that person?
14	A Nina Porter.
15	Q After Nina Porter.
16	A Andrew Royer, sorry.
17	Q Okay. Based upon what you had learned from Nina
18	and the information that you had at that time, did
19	the interview of Andrew Royer provide crucial
20	information about the murder of Helen Sailor?
21	A Yes.
22	MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. I believe
23	that's a multiple question.
24	THE COURT: Rephrase your question.
25	1111

	1	BY MS. BECKER:
12	2	Q Okay. After you had gained this information from
3	3	Nina Porter and the interview with Andy Royer, did
4		the investigation take on a new character?
5	5	A Yes, it did.
6		Q Were you able to identify suspects at that time?
7		A Yes, we were.
8		Q Now, did you actually conduct the interview with
9		Andrew Royer when he was first interviewed in
10		August or September of 2003?
11		A No, ma'am, I did not.
12		Q Did you observe some of it?
13		A Some of it I did.
14		Q And were you privy to the information obtained
15		during that interview?
16		A Yes
17		Q Was there a subsequent interview of Andrew Royer
18		just a day later?
19	1	Yes, there was.
20	,	Did you conduct that interview?
21	Į z	No, I did.
22	2	Were you did you observe that interview?
23	A	I don't believe I did.
24	Q	Were you privy to information in that interview?
25	A	Maybe from a supplement or a statement.
	1	1

1	. ç	Was it consistent with the information that he
2		provided the first day?
3	A	A It varied.
4		Now, after you had these things and later on, did
5		you actually interview Andrew Royer?
6	A	Yes, I did.
7	Ω	When did that take place?
8	A	It's about a year ago. It was June of 2004.
9	Q	Okay. When you interviewed Andrew Royer, did you
10		advise him of his rights?
11	A	Yes, I did.
12	Q	How did that come about?
13	A	I read I read his Miranda Form right to him.
14		There were two attorneys present. He stated
15		that Andy Andy stated that he wanted to come
16		clean.
17	Q	Did he review his rights?
18	A	Yes, he did.
19	Q	Did he acknowledge that he understood them?
20	A	Yes, he did.
21	Q	Did he waive those rights in your presence?
22	A	Yes, he did.
23	Q	All right. Now, did you ask him questions about
24		the murder of Helen Sailor at that time?
25	A	Yes, I did.
		,

1 Q Now, you were aware of what he had said earlier. 2 Correct? 3 Α Correct. 4 Q When you go into a subsequent interview knowing 5 what hasn't been said earlier, do you suggest or do 6 you remind them of what they said earlier as 7 they're giving new information? 8 Α Yes. If they get to a point where it's -- well, no, I don't. But if it gets to a point where the 9 10 story is totally different, we might remind them 11 that, hey, your story is different. 12 Q In fact, why don't you educate us a little bit on 13 how you take a statement. What do you do in order 14 to get information from an individual that you 15 believe may be involved in a crime? 16 A What I usually do is I would -- in this case, I 17 took Andy back to the Thanksgiving of 2002, start 18 from the morning when he woke up, and I just let 19 him talk like he did, let him answer, you know, 20 what happened next. Okay. What happened next. 21 Okay. And just kind of go from there. 22 know if that answers your question. 23 Q Uh-huh. Even though you're aware of things that such as physical evidence or what he said before, 24 25 do you interject that to try to get him back on

1.		track, or do you just let him do his thing?
2	A	I let him do his thing. I don't want to provide
3		him with anything.
4	Q	Why is that?
5	A	Because that would appear to be leading.
6	Q	When you spoke to Mr. Royer about a year ago and
7		you started asking him questions abut what happened
8		on Thanksgiving, what did Mr. Royer tell you
9		happened on Thanksgiving of 2002?
10	A	He said that his mother came over to highrise,
11		picked him up. He said that he left the highrise
12		with his mom at 1:00 p.m. and got back to the
13		highrise being dropped off by his mother at 4:00
14		p.m. He said he came back to his room, he took a
15		nap
16		MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, may we approach.
17		(An off-the-record discussion was held
18		at the bench.)
19		THE COURT: Correct, Mr. Zook, not necessary to
20	have	that recorded. Is that correct?
21		MR. ZOOK: That's right.
22		THE COURT: Ms. Becker, proceed.
23	BY MS	BECKER:
24	Q	Okay. So, the defendant Andy Royer indicated that
25		he had been picked up at one dropped off at four.

	1	What happened next?
,	2 <i>F</i>	He stated to me that he came back to the apartment,
:	3	took a nap, woke up, went to Martins Supermarket,
4	1	bought a case of beer, drank about eight years, and
-5	5	got really drunk, and came back to his room.
ϵ	S Q	Did he say what he did when he came back to his
7		room after getting or came back, got really
8		drunk, and then what did he do?
9	A	Went back to bed.
10	Q	All right. Was this consistent with the
11		information that Mr. Royer had provided before?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Okay. Did you point that out to him?
14	A	I believe I did.
15	Q	Did he change his story at all?
16	A	He didn't change his story.
17	Q	Okay. In fact, how many different versions from
18		the defendant were you aware of by this point?
19		THE COURT: Excuse me. When you say "the
20	defen	dant," are you referring to Mr. Royer.
21		MS. BECKER: I'm sorry. Andrew Royer.
22		THE WITNESS: I believe three or four.
23	BY MS	BECKER:
24	Q	In an investigation, does that throw up some red
25		flags for you?
- 1		

		DIRECT)
-	1	A Yes.
2	2	Q Now, the defendant Andy Royer told you during your
3	3	interview he wash't there.
4		A Correct.
5		Q Okay. Did that alone make him a suspect just the
6		fact that he was lying to you?
7		MR. CRAWFORD: Objection, your Honor.
8		THE COURT: Rephrase your question.
9	BY	MS: BECKER:
10		The fact that it had been inconsistent from
11		previous statements?
12	A	Yes.
13	0	Are you also familiar with the investigation as it
14		focussed around Lana Canen?
15	A	Yes, I was.
16	Ω	Was Lana Canen originally interviewed by detectives
17		back when this murder occurred in 2002?
18	A	Well, they made several attempts to get ahold of
19		her, but I do not believe there was any formal
20		statement taken from her at all.
21	Q	Okay. Do you know if they ever actually just
22		talked to her?
23	A	They did talk to her.
24	Q	Some time later, did a detective with the homicide
25		division, well, in August of 2003 have an

		DIRECT)
1		opportunity to interview Lana Canen?
2	1	A Yes.
3	(Okay. Did you actually conduct that interview
4		yourself?
5	A	No, I did.
6	0	Did you observe that interview or parts thereof?
7	A	I believe parts of it I did.
8	Q	Okay. Did Lana Canen provide a story or a version
9		of where she was on Thanksgiving of 2002?
10	A	Yes, she did.
11	Q	Subsequent to that, were you able to interview
12		additional witnesses to corroborate or contradict
13		that information?
14	A	Yes, I was.
15	Q	Did they corroborate it or contradict it?
16		MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor.
17		THE COURT: Sustained.
18		MR. ZOOK: This is just hearsay
19		THE COURT: Sustained.
20	BY M	S. BECKER:
21	Q	Has it been your experience that when an
22		investigation does not have any suspects to begin
23		with it's difficult to put things in context?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Once you obtained the additional statements from

	1	Andrew Royer and Lana Canen, were you able then to
	2	go back and look at the original information
	3	obtained and put it into context?
	4	A Yes.
!	5	Q Once you have done that, do you put the entire
(6	investigation together for purposes of presenting
7	7	it at a trial?
8	3	A Yes, we do.
9	,	MS. BECKER: Can I have just a moment, your
10		Honor.
11		THE COURT: You may.
12		(An off-the-record discussion was held
13		between counsel for the state.)
14		MS. BECKER: No further questions at this time.
15		THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions?
16		MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
17		THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford, any questions?
18		MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.
19		CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	В	Y MR. ZOOK:
21		Q Detective, when was it that you first got involved
22		in this homicide investigation?
23		A I believe it was August of 2003.
24		Q And you made references to the early stages of the
25		investigation. Am I to assume that you relied upon
	1	1

1	L		information in making those statements earlier in
2	2		your testimony?
3	3	A	I don't understand the question.
4		Q	You made statements concerning how your how the
5			initial investigation began. How were you able to
6			come up with that information?
7		A	I I read it.
8		Q	So you read it. You actually were not a
9			participant in that initial investigation. Is that
10			correct?
11		A	That's correct.
12		Q	Now, in reading those statements, did you come
13			across the various the various names of people
14			during the course of the investigation early on?
15	1	A	Yes.
16	,	2	And of those individuals was an individual by the
17			name of Larry Woodridge?
18	A	Ā	Yes.
19	Q	2	And I believe he was resident of the Highrise. Is
20			that correct?
21	A		That's correct.
22	Q		And also an individual by the name of Tony Thomas.
23			Is that correct?
24	A		That's correct.
25	Q		And you mentioned that the first red flags were

1 Andrew Royer and Lana Canen. Isn't that correct? 2 Α When we -- when we took it. 3 Just your portion of the investigation, not the Q initial investigation. 4 5 Α That's correct. 6 Okay. So you were -- when you spoke that way, you Q 7 were relying upon only your portion of the 8 investigation. 9 Α But we looked at the old -- we looked at the 10 old information. We take that into account so that 11 when we start the new investigation, you know, we 12 form our own investigation and our -- our own 13 suspects. 14 But if there were any red flags early on, those 15 might have come from either Detective Thayer or 16 Detective Christian. Is that correct? 17 Α That's correct. 18 Q Because they were the private investigators? 19 That's correct, but we still -- we still check Α those out. Q Okay. Now, you mentioned that you were only actually involved specifically with the last interview of Mr. Royer. Is that correct? Α That's correct. Did you have any participation whatsoever in the Q

20

21

22

23

24

25

,	1		initial interviews or interrogations with Mr.
:0	2		Royer?
3	3	A	I didn't sit in sit on in with Mr. Royer. There
4	ı		were portions of of it that I witnessed on a
5	,		close circuit television, but I did not participate
6			in the room.
7		Q	Were you there when he was driven to the Elkhart
8			Police Department?
9		A	Yes.
10		Q	And were you present with him when you went to
11			the or when he was taken to the Elkhart Police
12			Department?
13		A	Yes, I was.
14		Q	Did he comply with your request to go?
15		A	He certainly did.
16		Q	And that first time that you spoke with him, do you
17			recall the date of that?
18		A	Not off the top of my head.
19		Q	Okay. The first time that he was spoken with, was
20			that the date of the first initial report was done
21			with Mr. Royer that same day, to your knowledge?
22		A	Yes, sir.
23		Q	And when you picked him up, do you know if he had
24			his medication before he was taken to the police
25			station?
			-

	i		
	1	A	I don't know for sure if he had his medication or
	2		not.
	3	Q	Do you know if he had it with him when he went to
	4		the police station?
í	5	A	I don't think he did.
6	5	Q	That's your recollection (intelligible)?
² 7	,	A	That's my recollection.
8		Q	Do you recall what time it was that you took him to
9			the police station the first time?
10		A	It was in the morning. I would say around close to
11			9:00 a.m.
12		Q	Now, you mentioned that you had interviewed or
13			reinterviewed a lot of witnesses in the beginning
14			of August of 2003. Is that correct?
15		A	Yes, sir.
16		Q	Were a lot of these individuals present or located
17			at the highrise where Ms. Sailor had died?
18		A	Yes.
19			MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your
20	Но	nor.	
21			THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any other questions?
22			MS. BECKER: Yes, thank you.
23			REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	ВУ	MS.	BECKER:
25	Ç	<u> Y</u>	ou indicated that you do refer back to the
ŀ			1

1		original detectives and their written documentation
2		in beginning your case review. Is that correct?
3	A	Yes.
4	Ω	Is it a requirement that you go ahead and provide
5		supplements or police reports whenever you do
6		things on a case?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	All right. And is that something that you put in
9		as many details as you can remember?
10	A	Yes
11	Q	And then do you rely on that when you are
12		furthering an investigation?
13	A	Yes
14	Q	Do you take it as gospel, or do you do your own
15		investigation?
16	A	We do our own investigation.
17	Q	After reviewing what had been previously been done,
18		did you then go back out and ensure that you had
19		all of your questions answered as well?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	All right. Now, several names were mentioned.
22		Larry Williams, Tony Thomas. Was further
23		investigation done with those individuals?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	In fact, Matt Johnson, Martha Haff, many other
Į.	1	

1		people were mentioned in this investigation.
2,		Correct?
3	A	That's correct:
4	Q	Now, did the detectives in homicide focus on
5		following up on those types of leads?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	In fact, how far did you push those kinds of leads?
8	A	We pushed them until we couldn't follow anymore.
9	Q	During this time did any evidence arrive?
10	A	No evidence.
11	Q	Well, that showed that anyone other than the
12	1	defendants were responsible for Helen Sailor's
13	1	death?
14	A	No.
15	Q	Okay. Was there any evidence you could put your
16		finger on at all that would indicate that Tony
17		Thomas or Larry Wood or any of these other people
18		had anything to do with this?
19	A	There was no evidence.
20	Q	Mr. Crawford mentioned any other red flags. Even
21		if it wasn't a name or a person, if there was a red
22		flag or something that didn't sit right with you in
23		the investigation, did you follow-up on it?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Did anything lead to any place other than the

1 defendants in this case? 2 Α Nothing else 3 And when you reinterviewed people in August of Q 4 2003, did you find that the information that you 5 obtained from them -- actually, strike that. What was one of the biggest challenges that you found in 6 7 the witnesses in this case? The biggest challenge when reinterviewing all these 8 Α 9 witnesses, a lot of them had mental -- diminished 10 mental capabilities, that was really hard. A lot of them were elderly, so a lot of them had -- they 11 12 had trouble communicating to you. 13 We had to, you know, we had to slow down when 14 we talked to the elderly and not be too fast just 15 so they could understand our -- our questions. 16 Waterfall Highrise just has a lot of tough 17 witnesses because you have the elderly, and you got 18 people with mental -- diminished mental capability. 19 That was the toughest aspect of this case. 20 In light of the fact that you had these types of Q 21 witnesses -- well, let me ask you this. When you 22 get a statement from somebody, even if it doesn't 23 seem to be accurate, do you still record it the way 24 that they say it? 25 Α Yes.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1	Q	Why?	
2	A	Because it's their words. It's accurate to them.	
3	Q	Okay. Can you make any firm decisions just based	
4		upon looking at one statement from one person and	
5		saying, boy, this is it?	
6	A	No. It's just a part of the puzzle.	
7	Q	Has it been your experience that you have to wait	
8		until you get everything?	
9	A	Yes	
10	Q	I'm sorry. Before you can start putting things	
11		together?	
12	A	That's correct.	
13	Q	Is that what happened in this case?	
14	A	That's what happened in this case.	
15		MS. BECKER: I don't have anything further	
16	Thanks.		
17		THE COURT: Does anybody have any other	
18	questions, Mr. Crawford?		
19		MR. CRAWFORD: I do, your Honor	
20		RECROSS-EXAMINATION	
21	BY MR.	CRAWFORD:	
22	Q	You mentioned that several of the people that you	
23	:	spoke to had diminished mental capacity. Is that	
24		correct?	
25	A	That's correct.	

1	Q	During the course of your conversations with Mr.
2		Royer and your involvement with him, would you
3		classify him in that category?
4	A	Yes, I would.
5	Q	During the course of your investigation, did you
6		come into contact with a lady by the name of Mary
7		Jane Dejong?
8	A	Yes, I did.
9	Q	And did you specifically interview her?
10	A	Yes, I did.
11	Q	Was she do you recall during the course of your
12		investigation where she resided?
13	A	I believe it was on the tenth floor room 1001.
14	Q	About the same location area where Helen Sailor
15		resided?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Did you follow-up on any leads that she gave you?
18	A	Yes. Yes, I did.
19	Q	Did those take you anywhere?
20	A	No.
21		MR. CRAWFORD: Nothing further, your Honor.
22		THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions?
23		MR. ZOOK: No questions.
24		THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any other questions?
25		MS. BECKER: No questions.
i i		I